DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 957 CS 206 405

AUTHOR Davis, Nancy
TITLE Evaluating the Evaluators: Comparative Study of High School Newspaper Critique Services.
PUB DATE Aug 81
NOTE 22p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (64th, East Lansing, MI, August 8-11, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Comparative Analysis: *Evaluation Methods; *Evaluators; Faculty Advisers; High Schools; Journalism Education; *School Newspapers; *Student Publications
IDENTIFIERS Columbia Scholastic Press Association; National Scholastic Press Association; Quill and Scroll

ABSTRACT

High school publication staffs depend on national critique services as a major means of evaluation and recognition, but most have no measure of how one critique service compares to the others, because they can afford the entry fee for only one evaluation. Thus, a study was conducted to test the validity of three major national critique services--Columbia Scholastic Press Association (CSPA), National Scholastic Press Association (NSPA), and Quill and Scroll--by submitting nine school newspapers for evaluation by all three services. The school newspapers all were produced in a midwestern state, and none had been submitted for evaluation within the three years prior to the study. The evaluation scorebooks indicated that Quill and Scroll placed a greater emphasis on content/coverage, NSPA stressed physical appearance, and CSPA emphasized writing, editing, and physical appearance. CSPA was the only service that emphasized the writing/editing section. Only two of the papers received a first place rating across the three services, and ratings assigned to two test papers by NSPA contradicted the explanation of the ratings in the scorebook. Quill and Scroll appeared to be the most difficult service from which to get a top rating. Staff and advisers should first decide on the strength of their publications and then submit them to the service emphasizing that area. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED205957

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Secondary Education Division

Student Paper

EVALUATING THE EVALUATORS:

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF HIGH SCHOOL NEWSPAPER CRITIQUE SERVICES

by

Nancy Davis
Graduate Student
School of Journalism
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nancy Davis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS206405

Presented to the Secondary Education Division, Association for Education in Journalism annual convention, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich., August 1981.

Evaluating the Evaluators:

A Comparative Study of High School Newspaper Critique Services

High school newspaper advisers and staffs pack up issues of their newspapers and send them off to national critique services every year to see how their publications compare with other school newspapers. Staff members wait for the critiques to be returned, hoping for an award that will give them the recognition they think they deserve. Advisers look forward to positive reinforcement of the journalistic skills they have taught during the school year. And some administrators use the returned critiques as a method of evaluating a school's journalism program.

Critique services influence the quality of high school publications by setting evaluative standards. Staffs wanting to win awards pattern their newspapers and yearbooks after these established guidelines. For many staffs, critical service ratings reflect the value of an entire year's work.

High school publication staffs depend on national critique services as a major means of evaluation and recognition; yet most staffs have no measure of how one critique service compares to the others. The major critique services are designed to provide an evaluation of a newspaper's success and recommendations for improvement. Unless a staff can afford entry fees for more than one critique service, that staff has only one judge's opinion and no measure of the validity of the critique.

This study attempts to do what few high school publications can afford to do. It attempts to test the validity of three major national critique services (Columbia Scholastic Press Association, National Scholastic Press Association, and Quill and Scroll) by entering newspapers from test schools in all three services. A comparison of the total scores and section scores indicate on what items the services agree and disagree.

Findings in Brief

Examination of the total scores and section scores, the scorebooks, and the ratings assigned to each of the test newspapers led to these conclusions:

1. National Scholastic Press Association (NSPA) and Quill and Scroll showed significant agreement on total scores. This conclusion was supported by significant agreement in two of the four sections. The two services agreed in the content/coverage and the editorial sections; however, they disagreed in the writing/editing and physical appearance sections.
2. A comparison of the total scores from Columbia Scholastic Press Association (CSPA) and Quill and Scroll suggested moderate agreement between these services; however, comparisons of section scores did not support this agreement. In each of the four sections, the two services showed substantial differences in judging.
3. Examination of the total scores from NSPA and CSPA suggested there was little agreement between these two services. NSPA and CSPA also showed significant disagreement in three sections: content/coverage, editorials, and physical appearance. These two critique services did show agreement, however, in the writing/editing section.
4. Critique services emphasize different aspects of newspaper production by assigning different percentages of the total scores to each section. This may account for low agreement within sections but moderate agreement in total score as was shown in the comparison of CSPA and Quill and Scroll.
5. The critique services do not agree on the ratings assigned to the test newspapers. Quill and Scroll placed five of the six newspapers in its "International First Place" division and one paper in "International Third Place." CSPA rated three newspapers "First Place," two "Second Place," and one "Third Place." National Scholastic Press Association spread the ratings from "All American," the service's top award based on the score book alone, to "Third Class."

This study was limited to nine test newspapers because of the expense incurred through critique service entry fees. The small number of cases poses some problems in stating generalizations from the results; however, this report does suggest areas that advisers should be aware of when evaluating the critiques and areas that critical service directors should consider in preparing future guidebooks.

Description of the Study

To test the validity of three national critique services, an experiment was designed wherein selected schools would submit newspapers to the three services. The hypothesis of the study was that there would be substantial disagreement among critique services in their judgments of high school newspapers.

In the spring of 1977, nine Indiana high school newspapers were chosen to participate in this project. Because the critique services have different newspaper classifications, the test papers had to be similar to insure that all newspapers would be judged in comparable classifications by the three services. All test papers were printed offset, distributed biweekly, and produced in schools with enrollments of 1400 to 1700. Another requirement was that the newspaper could not have been sent to any critique service within three years prior to this study. This requirement removed the factor of a newspaper being recognized by one service while being new to the others.

Because the requirements of the critique services differ, this study could not follow ideal field experiment conditions by sending identical sets of newspapers to all three services, but the same time periods were used for each separate service. Quill and Scroll judges on the basis of six newspapers, three from each semester, produced during a school year. The nine test schools sent Quill and Scroll papers from the 1976-1977 school year. Because CSPA requires a complete file of issues from a calendar year, schools sent papers

produced between January 1, 1977 and December 10, 1977. NSPA uses semester evaluations, so test schools entered second semester papers from the 1976-1977 school year and first semester papers from the 1977-1978 school year.

Evaluations were collected from six of the nine test schools. Three advisers failed to enter their publications in the critique services.

Validity, the condition of a measure being supported by other measures, was tested using the total scores and section scores from each of the critique services. Total scores from each of the critique services were first rank ordered, assigning the numeral "1" to the highest score, "2" to the next highest score, etc., Because NSPA scores the semesters separately, the two scores were averaged to obtain a score representative of all material submitted. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient, which indicates the magnitude of the difference in rankings, was then performed three times to find the differences between CSPA and NSPA, CSPA and Quill and Scroll, and NSPA and Quill and Scroll.

To determine the validity of the critique services' judgments within sections, the sections and scores were first standardized before applying the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient formula.[1] Standard categories were developed which represent the aspects considered by all three services and reflect the number of points awarded for each phase of production. The four standard categories are content/coverage, writing/editing, editorials, and physical appearance.

After the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients were computed for the total scores and section scores, the correlations were categorized as being slight, low, moderate, high or very high, according to J.P. Guilford's definition of these terms.[2] A strong moderate correlation of .5 or greater was considered indicative of agreement between services.

Detailed Findings

Because the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient formula can accommodate

only two services at a time, the formula was applied three times to find the differences between NSPA and Quill and Scroll, CSPA and Quill and Scroll, and CSPA and NSPA. (See Table 1)

Comparison of NSPA and Quill and Scroll Scores

In this study, NSPA and Quill and Scroll had the highest correlation coefficient, suggesting greater agreement between these two services than in the other comparisons. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient calculated for total scores from these two services was .772. This indicates a high correlation between NSPA and Quill and Scroll, according to Guilford's definition. The greatest numerical difference in the ranks assigned to the newspapers according to total scores was two; Newspaper C, which had the highest score of the papers sent to Quill and Scroll, had the third highest score from NSPA. Both critique services considered Newspaper A the lowest scoring paper. All other ranks assigned to the test newspapers differed by only one. (See Table 2)

Comparisons of section scores substantiated the high correlation of total scores from the two services. There was a marked relationship between the judgments of NSPA and Quill and Scroll in the content/coverage section and in the editorials section.

The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient calculated for the content/coverage section was.886, which by definition suggests a high correlation between NSPA and Quill in this section. In both services, Newspaper A was the lowest scoring paper, and Newspaper C was the third highest scoring paper. The ranks assigned to the test papers according to scores in this section differed by no more than one.

In the editorials section, the correlation coefficient was .843, suggesting agreement between NSPA and Quill and Scroll. In rank ordering the

newspapers from Quill and Scroll, there was a tie for first rank between Newspapers C and F; each was assigned the rank of 1.5. Both NSPA and Quill and Scroll considered Newspaper F the highest scoring paper and Newspaper B the fourth highest scoring paper. The greatest difference in ranks assigned to the test papers was 1.5. Newspaper C, which was tied for first rank in Quill and Scroll scores was ranked third according to NSPA scores.

Correlation coefficients calculated for the other two sections, writing/editing and physical appearance, were both .243. According to Guilford, this suggested a "low correlation; definite but small relationship."[3] In the writing/editing section, Newspaper A was ranked sixth and Newspaper B was ranked fourth according to scores from both services. The differences in the rank orderings of the other newspapers showed significant disagreement between the services. Newspaper F was the highest scoring paper in this section according to NSPA, but the newspaper had the fifth highest Quill and Scroll score. Newspaper E was tied for second rank, according to Quill and Scroll writing/editing scores but was ranked fifth according to NSPA scores. Newspaper C, which was ranked first in Quill and Scroll scores, was ranked third according to NSPA scores.

In the physical appearance section, the ranks of Newspapers B and D showed the greatest differences between NSPA and Quill and Scroll. Newspaper B was tied for first rank according to Quill and Scroll scores in this section; however, the paper was ranked fifth according to NSPA scores. Newspaper D, which had the highest score from NSPA, was ranked fourth according to Quill and Scroll scores.

Comparison of CSPA and Quill and Scroll Scores

The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient calculated for total scores from CSPA and Quill and Scroll suggested there was agreement between the two critique services. The correlation coefficient between the two services was

.5, the lowest correlation considered indicative of agreement. The smallest difference in ranks assigned to the test papers based on total scores was .5. Newspaper F was tied for second rank according to CSPA scores and was ranked third according to Quill and Scroll scores. Newspaper B demonstrated the greatest difference; it was the highest scoring paper in CSPA but the fourth ranked paper in Quill and Scroll.

The agreement between CSPA and Quill and Scroll, suggested by the correlation coefficient of .5, was contradicted by comparisons of section scores. In three of the sections, there were slight correlations between CSPA and Quill and Scroll. According to Guilford, a slight correlation shows an "almost negligible relationship."[4] In the fourth section, there was a low correlation.

The comparison of content/coverage scores from CSPA and Quill and Scroll resulted in the lowest correlation coefficient of all the comparisons made. The correlation coefficient between the two services in this section was -.03. In the rank orderings, Newspaper B was fourth and Newspaper E was fifth according to scores from both services. Newspaper D demonstrated the greatest difference in ranks; it received the highest score of the test papers from Quill and Scroll but the lowest score from CSPA. Newspaper A, which received the lowest score from Quill and Scroll, was ranked third according to its score from CSPA.

With a correlation coefficient of .043, there seemed to be little agreement between CSPA and Quill and Scroll in the writing/editing section. The differences in the ranks of Newspapers A,B, and C in the two services were only one. The greatest difference in ranks was four; Newspaper F was ranked first according to CSPA scores but was ranked fifth according to Quill and Scroll scores. Newspapers D and E were tied for second rank based on Quill and Scroll scores. However, Newspaper D was ranked fourth and Newspaper E was

ranked sixth according to CSPA scores.

The correlation coefficient for the two services in the editorials section was .186. This suggested a slight correlation between the two services in this section. The smallest difference in ranks was .5. Newspaper C was the highest scoring test paper in CSPA and was tied for first rank with Newspaper F in Quill and Scroll scores. The greatest difference in ranks was demonstrated by Newspaper A; it was ranked second according to its CSPA score and sixth according to its Quill and Scroll score. Newspaper F, which was tied for first rank in the Quill and Scroll scores was ranked fourth in the CSPA scores.

CSPA and Quill and Scroll had the highest section correlation coefficient in the physical appearance section; however, the coefficient of .386 suggested a low correlation between the two services. Newspaper D was ranked fourth according to scores from both services. Newspaper B was the highest scoring paper from CSPA and was tied with Newspaper F for the highest scoring paper from Quill and Scroll. The greatest numerical difference between ranks was three. Newspaper C was ranked second in CSPA scores and fifth in Quill and Scroll scores. Newspaper E was ranked sixth in CSPA scores and third in Quill and Scroll scores.

Although a study of the total scores suggested there was agreement between CSPA and Quill and Scroll, this conclusion was difficult to substantiate when each of the section comparisons demonstrated significant disagreement. The correlation coefficient of total scores being higher than any of the section coefficients might be the result of the two services devoting different percentages of their total scores to each of the four sections.

Comparison of NSPA and CSPA Scores

The comparison of total scores from NSPA and CSPA resulted in the lowest Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient for total scores, .129. This sug-

gested that there was less agreement between these two critique services than in other comparisons. This coefficient is classified as a slight correlation and suggests an "almost negligible relationship"[5] between CSPA and NSPA. Newspapers C and F demonstrated the smallest difference in ranks. These newspapers were tied for second rank according to CSPA total scores. Newspaper C was ranked third and Newspaper F was ranked second, based on NSPA scores. The greatest difference in ranks was Newspaper B which had the highest of the CSPA scores but the fifth highest NSPA score. Another significant difference was in the ranks of Newspaper D; it was ranked first according to NSPA scores but fourth according to CSPA scores.

Examination of section scores from CSPA and NSPA supported the conclusion that there was little agreement between these two critique services. Correlation coefficients for three of the four section were classified as showing slight or low correlations.

In the editorials section, the correlations coefficient of .086 suggested "an almost negligible realtionship"[6] between CSPA and NSPA. Newspaper E received the lowest score of the test papers from both services; however, the ranks of three papers differed by three. Newspaper F, which received the highest score from NSPA, was ranked fourth according to CSPA scores. Newspaper D was ranked second in NSPA scores but fifth in CSPA scores. And Newspaper A, which was ranked fifth in NSPA scores, was ranked second according to CSPA scores.

The correlation coefficient for CSPA and NSPA in the physical appearance section was also .086, indicating a slight correlation between the two services. In this section, the ranks of Newspapers A, C, and F differed by no more than one position. Newspaper B, however, received the highest score of the test papers from CSPA but the fifth highest from NSPA. Newspaper D, which received the highest NSPA score, was ranked fourth according to CSPA scores.

In the content coverage section, CSPA and NSPA had a correlation coefficient of .2. This was categorized as a low correlation according to Guildford and suggested a "definite but small relationship."[7] Both services gave Newspaper F the highest score of the test papers. Newspaper D showed the greatest difference in rankings; it was ranked second in NSPA scores but was ranked sixth in CSPA scores. Newspaper A, which was ranked sixth in NSPA scores, was ranked third in CSPA scores.

The writing/editing section was the only area where agreement between CSPA and NSPA was indicated. The correlation coefficient of .772 suggested a high correlation between the two critique services. Newspaper F was ranked first based on scores from both services. The greatest difference in ranks was demonstrated by Newspaper D which was ranked second in NSPA scores and fourth in CSPA scores. The ranks of the other test papers differed by only one position.

Examination of Scorebooks

Each of the critique services emphasizes a different aspect of newspaper production by assigning different percentages of the total score to the various sections. This may explain the situation of two services showing low agreement within sections but moderate agreement in total scores, as was the case in the CSPA and Quill and Scroll comparison.

The three critique services studied organize their scorebooks differently. CSPA divides its scorebook into three section: Content/Coverage, Writing/Editing, and Design/Display. Quill and Scroll uses four sections: Medium to Inform Readers, Medium to Influence, How Our Publication Entertains Readers, and The Business Enterprise. The five sections used by NSPA are Content and Coverage, Writing and Editing, Editorial Leadership and Opinion Features, Physical Appearance and Visual Communication, and Photography, Art and Use of Graphics.

The four standardized categories developed for the correlation study also indicated that the critique services emphasize different sections. (See Table 3)

Quill and Scroll places a greater emphasis on content/coverage than on the other sections by devoting 35 percent of the total points to this section. Quill and Scroll evalutates policy guidelines from Medium to Inform Readers, Medium to Influence, and How Our Publication Entertains Readers. In this section, the critique service also examines how newspapers cover general, classroom, school life, and local news. Quill and Scroll devotes 15 percent more points to this section than either of the other critique services.

Allocating 38.9 percent of its total points, NSPA stresses physical appearance. In this section, NSPA examines the overall design plan, headline and body type selection, printing quality, and the layout design of all sections of the newspaper. Photographs, cartoons, and art are also evaluated in this section. CSPA allots a similar percentage of its points to physical appearance; however, only 16.5 percent of the Quill and Scroll points are allocated for physical appearance.

The two sections emphasized by CSPA are writing/editing and physical appearance; each section receives 35 percent of the total points. In the writing/editing section, judges evaluate news, in-depth, feature, and sport stories. They also judge headlines and cutlines and evaluate the journalistic principles demonstrated by the newspaper. CSPA is the only service to emphasize the writing/editing section.

Comparison of Ratings

One thing the critique services disagreed on was the ratings assigned to the test newspapers. Each critique service defines its rating using

different percentages of its total points, and each service gives its ratings different names. Quill and Scroll placed five of the six test newspapers in its "International First Place" category and one in the "International Third Place" division. CSPA gave three newspapers "First Place" ratings, two "Second Place" ratings, and one "Third Place" rating. Because NSPA uses semester evaluations, each newspaper received two ratings, one from each semester. The ratings from NSPA for both semesters ranged from "All American," the service's top award based on the scorebook alone, to "Third Class."

Quill and Scroll awards newspapers one of five possible achievement ratings based on scores. When this study was done, an "International Honor Rating" designated newspapers which had received 90 to 100 percent of the possible score. Newspapers earning 80 to 89 percent of the possible score were given "International First Place" awards, and newspapers receiving 70 to 79 percent of the score were presented "International Second Place" awards. "International Third Place" awards signify newspapers earning 60 to 69 percent of the possible score. A newspaper earning less than 60 percent of the possible points is designated as a "Fourth Place" paper but no award is given. With the 1978 Newsmedia Evaluation, Quill and Scroll restructured this rating system.

CSPA grants four ratings based on score plus a "Medalist" award. Newspapers receiving 85 to 100 percent of the possible score were given "First Place" ratings, and newspapers earning 70 to 84 percent of the points received "Second Place" ratings. "Third Place" ratings went to newspapers which earned 50 to 69 percent of the possible score, and "Fourth Place" was awarded to any newspaper receiving less than 50 percent of the total score. The "Medalist" award, granted to newspapers selected from "First Place" ratings, is "based on those intangible qualities which become evident to the

judges which could be characterized as the 'personality' of the entry."[8]

NSPA awards five ratings to newspapers participating in its critique service. Its rating scale varies according to the newspaper classification and the year. The rating scale which is described here applied to the classification in which all test papers were judged. A "First Class" award designated newspapers receiving 3800 to 4500 points; this is 84 to 100 percent of the possible score. Newspapers earning 2900 to 3799 points, or 64 to 83 percent of the possible score, received "Second Class" ratings. A "Third Class" rating signified a newspaper had received 2000 to 2899 points, or 44 to 63 percent of the possible score. Any newspaper earning less than 2000 points received a "Fourth Class" rating. NSPA's top award based on the scorebook alone is the "All American" rating. "First Class" newspapers are eligible for an "All American" rating which is awarded to newspapers receiving at least four of a possible five Marks of Distinction. Judges give Marks of Distinction for "unusually high quality and especially creative or distinctly lively, appealing work"[9] in the areas defined by the sections of the scorebook.

Only two of the six test newspapers received consistent ratings from the three critique services. Newspaper C received Quill and Scroll's "International First Place" award, CSPA's "First Place" rating, and "First Class" ratings from NSPA in both semester evaluations. Newspaper F also rated consistently; it received an "International First Place" from Quill and Scroll and a "First Place" from CSPA. In NSPA's evaluations, Newspaper F received a "First Class" rating one semester and an "All American" for the other semester.

The critique services did not agree on the ratings assigned to the other test newspapers. Newspaper E ran the gamut of ratings. It received Quill and Scroll's "International First Place," CSPA's "Third Place," and

"Second Class" ratings for both of NSPA's evaluations. Newspaper B received an "International First Place" from Quill and Scroll and a "First Place" from CSPA. Newspaper B, however, did not fare as well in the NSPA critiques; it received "Second Class" and "Third Class" ratings from that service. Newspaper D received Quill and Scroll's "International First Place" and NSPA's "First Class" and "All American" ratings. CSPA gave Newspaper D a "Second Place." Newspaper A received third place ratings from Quill and Scroll and NSPA; however, it was rated a "Second Place" newspaper by CSPA.

The ratings assigned to two test papers by NSPA contradicted an explanation of the ratings in the scorebook. NSPA's Newspaper Guidebook reads, "To receive an All American rating, a publication must first earn the highest numerical score for a First Class rating, or 4,500 points. It must then receive at least four of five possible Marks of Distinction."[10] Newspaper D, which received an "All American," earned only 4,405 points. Newspaper F earned the "All American" rating with only 3,978 points in the second semester evaluation of the 1976-77 school year. In that same semester evaluation, Newspaper D earned 4,125 points, a higher score than Newspaper F, but did not receive an "All American."

Implications

Examination of the scorebooks reveals that the critique services do not agree on what phase of newspaper production should be emphasized. If a staff and adviser want a high rating, they could first decide what the publication's strengths are and then enter the critique service which emphasizes that area. This practice could obviously become an abuse of the critique service. The staff and adviser would not benefit from a criticism of its weaknesses that another critique service might provide.

The comparison of ratings suggests that Quill and Scroll is the most

difficult service from which to get a high rating. Its rating system limits the top award, an "International Honor Rating," to newspapers earning 90 percent of the possible score.[11] CSPA and NSPA define their top awards with lower percentages of the possible scores. This observation seems to be supported by the six test newspapers. Five of the six papers were given "International First Place" awards. This award is really Quill and Scroll's second place rating; the "International Honor Rating" is its top award. Not one of the test papers was rated in Quill and Scroll's top category although newspapers did place in the top divisions of NSPA and CSPA.

Conclusions from this study are limited because of the small number of newspapers used to test the validity of the critique services. Six newspapers cannot represent the thousands of publications sent to critique services annually. This study can, however, suggest what might be happening on a wider scale.

This study suggests that there is little agreement among all three critique services. The comparison of scores from Quill and Scroll and NSPA was the only comparison that showed definite agreement.

Newspaper staffs and advisers desiring a more accurate evaluation of their newspaper should enter more than one critique service. A newspaper sent to any of the critique services is judged by only one person. Unless the newspaper is entered in more than one service, the staff receives one judge's opinion of that publication. Advisers should caution their students about this fact before entering a critique service. When the critique is returned, either a good or bad evaluation can be put in the proper perspective.

Students, advisers, and administrators should refrain from placing too much value on a rating from a critique service. If Newspaper E had been entered only in the CSPA critique service, that staff would have only a "Third Place" rating to reflects its year's work. Ratings from the other services

have a balancing effect on that low rating. Quill and Scroll gave the newspaper an "International First Place" rating and NSPA gave it two "Second Class" ratings.

Future research should investigate how staffs, advisers, and adminstrators use the evaluations from critique services.

Notes

[1]Because National Scholastic Press Association uses 4,500 points while the others use 1,000, the NSPA scores were converted to a 1,000-point scale by multiplying the scores by .2222. Because Quill and Scroll is the only service to include a business section, these scores have been excluded and the other Quill and Scroll section scores have been converted to a 1,000-point scale by multiplying them by 1.124.

[2]J.P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1956), p. 145.

< .20 slight; almost negligible relationship
.20 - .40 low correlation; definite but small relationship
.40 - .70 moderate correlation; substantial relationship
.70 - .90 high correlation; marked relationship
> .90 very high correlation; very dependable relationship

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Ibid.

[8]J.F. Paschal, ed., Newspaper Fundamentals (New York, 1976), p. 2.

[9]Dick Dworkin, Judy Mattson, and Mary Skar, Newspaper Guidebook (Minneapolis, 1969), p. 5.

[10]Jeanne Buckeye, ed., Newspaper Guidebook (Minneapolis, 1976), p. 4.

[11]The "International Honor Rating" described here was Quill and Scroll's highest award when this study was done. The critique service has since restructured its rating system and has renamed its top rating.

Table 1

Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients

Total Scores

NSPA and Quill and Scroll = .77
CSPA and Quill and Scroll = .50
NSPA and CSPA = .13

Section Scores

Content/coverage
NSPA and Quill and Scroll = .89
CSPA and Quill and Scroll = -.03
NSPA and CSPA = .20

Writing/editing
NSPA and Quill and Scroll = .24
CSPA and Quill and Scroll = .04
NSPA and CSPA = .77

Editorials
NSPA and Quill and Scroll = .84
CSPA and Quill and Scroll = .19
NSPA and CSPA = .09

Physical Appearance
NSPA and Quill and Scroll = .24
CSPA and Quill and Scroll = .39
NSPA and CSPA = .09

Table 2

Rank Orders of Total Scores and Section Scores

Total Scores

	NSPA		CSPA		Quill and Scroll	
	Rank	*Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Newspaper A	6	(2787.5)	5	(740)	6	(655)
Newspaper B	5	(3245)	1	(865)	4	(828)
Newspaper C	3	(3845)	2.5	(850)	1	(870)
Newspaper D	1	(4265)	4	(746)	2	(868)
Newspaper E	4	(3337.5)	6	(656)	5	(815)
Newspaper F	2	(4069)	2.5	(850)	3	(859)

*NSPA scores reported here are average scores based on the scores from the two semester evaluations.

Section Scores

Content/coverage

	NSPA		CSPA		Quill and Scroll	
	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Newspaper A	6	(120)	3	(172)	6	(236)
Newspaper B	5	(128)	4	(170)	4	(310)
Newspaper C	3	(161)	2	(173)	3	(332)
Newspaper D	2	(187)	6	(145)	1	(344)
Newspaper E	4	(131)	5	(147)	5	(309)
Newspaper F	1	(194)	1	(180)	2	(338)

Writing/editing

	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Newspaper A	6	(123)	5	(243)	6	(146)
Newspaper B	4	(172)	3	(300)	4	(201)
Newspaper C	3	(193)	2	(304)	1	(230)
Newspaper D	2	(208)	4	(271)	2.5	(215)
Newspaper E	5	(170)	6	(220)	2.5	(215)
Newspaper F	1	(212)	1	(318)	5	(197)

Editorials

	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Newspaper A	5	(112)	2	(93)	6	(107)
Newspaper B	4	(113)	3	(87)	4	(152)
Newspaper C	3	(146)	1	(97)	1.5	(157)
Newspaper D	2	(166)	5	(76)	3	(156)
Newspaper E	6	(92)	6	(62)	5	(124)
Newspaper F	1	(167)	4	(85)	1.5	(157)

Physical appearance

	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Newspaper A	6	(220)	5	(232)	6	(124)
Newspaper B	5	(272)	1	(308)	1.5	(166)
Newspaper C	3	(304)	2	(276)	5	(152)
Newspaper D	1	(356)	4	(254)	4	(158)
Newspaper E	4	(297)	6	(227)	3	(160)
Newspaper F	2	(328)	3	(267)	1.5	(166)

Table 3

Percentages of Scores Devoted to Standardized Sections

	Content/coverage	Writing/editing	Editorials	Physical Appearance
CSPA	19.5%	35.0%	10.5%	35.0%
NSPA	20.0%	23.3%	17.8%	38.9%
*Quill and Scroll	35.0%	22.5%	15.0%	16.5%

*Quill and Scroll percentages do not add up to 100 percent because it devotes 11 percent of its total score to an evaluation of business policy, financing, and circulation. Quill and Scroll is the only service to judge those areas.